

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

*SM*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/274,935    03/23/99    COVERT

K    EN997064

MARK LEVY  
SALZMAN & LEVY  
19 CHENANGO ST  
SUITE 606  
BINGHAMTON NY 13901

IM22/0619

EXAMINER

MARKOFF, A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1746

DATE MAILED:

06/19/01

*8*

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/274,935	Applicant(s) COVERT ET AL.	
	Examiner Alexander Markoff	Art Unit 1746	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 15) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                  | 18) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 16) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 19) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 17) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 20) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claim is indefinite because it is not clear how can the salt be selected from the group consisting of metal cations.

Should this salt comprise cations selected from the disclosed group?

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 5-148,658.

JP 5-148,658 teaches a method for cleaning copper comprising application to copper surfaces of microelectronic packages a cleaning solution as claimed.

The cleaning solution comprises an inorganic acid(s) as claimed – sulfuric, phosphoric, etc.

The cleaning solution comprises persulfate salt as claimed – ammonium persulfate.

The solution comprises a phosphate salt, which, at the same time, a surfactant.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 5-148,658.

JP 5-148,658 teaches a method for cleaning copper comprising application to copper surfaces of microelectronic packages a cleaning solution as claimed.

The cleaning solution comprises an inorganic acid(s) as claimed – sulfuric, phosphoric, etc.

The cleaning solution comprises persulfate salt as claimed – ammonium persulfate.

The solution comprises a phosphate salt, which, at the same time, a surfactant.

JP 5-148,658 does not specify the specific substrates and conventional steps of the process of manufacturing of integrated circuits recited by the claims.

However, the reference does not limit the disclosure to any specific substrate or step of the IC manufacturing.

It would have been obvious to an ordinary artisan at the time the invention was made to apply the method of JP 5-148,659 to any substrate having copper surfaces at any conventional step of IC manufacturing with reasonable expectation of adequate results.

Art Unit: 1746

7. Claims 3, 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 5-148,658 on view of Tsubai et al (US Patent NO 4,238,279).

JP 5-148,658 teaches a method for cleaning copper comprising application to copper surfaces of microelectronic packages a cleaning solution as claimed.

The cleaning solution comprises an inorganic acid(s) as claimed – sulfuric, phosphoric, etc.

The cleaning solution comprises persulfate salt as claimed – ammonium persulfate.

The solution comprises a phosphate salt, which, at the same time, a surfactant.

The reference does not recite the specifically claimed phosphate salts.

Tsubai et al teach that what is semiconductor industry meant under a general disclosure of phosphoric acid also includes the claimed phosphate salts and their mixtures with different phosphoric acids. See entire document, especially column 2, line 60 – column 3, line 6.

It would have been obvious to an ordinary artisan at the time the invention was made to use any conventional mixture of phosphoric and phosphate in the method of JP 5-148,658 with reasonable expectation of adequate results.

As to claim 7, it would have been obvious to an ordinary artisan at the time the invention was made to find an optimum concentrations for the components of the solution in the modified method of JP 5-148,658 by routine experimentation inside of the disclosed by the prior art ranges.

Art Unit: 1746

8. Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 5-148,658 on view of Arabinick (US Patent NO 5,855,805).

JP 5-148,658 teaches a method for cleaning copper comprising application to copper surfaces of microelectronic packages a cleaning solution as claimed.

The cleaning solution comprises an inorganic acid(s) as claimed – sulfuric, phosphoric, etc.

The cleaning solution comprises persulfate salt as claimed – ammonium persulfate.

The solution comprises a phosphate salt, which, at the same time, a surfactant.

The reference does not recite the specific surfactant claimed.

However, the claimed surfactant are all well-known and commercially available surfactants.

It would have been obvious to an ordinary artisan at the time the invention was made to use these surfactants in the method of JP 5-148,658 with reasonable expectation of adequate results in order to improve wettability of the solution.

On the other hand, Arabinick teaches that it was known to use the claimed surfactants in the methods for cleaning copper surfaces in manufacturing of IC.

It would have been obvious to an ordinary artisan at the time the invention was made to use the surfactants disclosed by Arabinick in the method of JP 5-148,658 for their primary purpose with reasonable expectation of adequate results because Arabinick teaches that the use of these surfactants improves the process.

Art Unit: 1746

***R sponse to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.


***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander Markoff whose telephone number is 703-308-7545. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30 - 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy P. Gulakowski can be reached on 703-308-4333. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7719 for regular communications and 703-305-7718 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0651.

**ALEXANDER MARKOFF  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

  
Alexander Markoff  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1746

am  
June 18, 2001